

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc.	)	
	)	
Petition for Waiver of the Definition of	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
“Study Area” Contained in Part 36,	)	
Appendix-Glossary and Sections 36.611,	)	
and 69.2(hh) of the Commission’s	)	
Rules	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS**

**Sandwich Isles Communicatiosn, Inc.**

**David Cosson  
Kraskin, Moorman & Cosson, LLC  
2120 L St., N.W., Suite 520  
Washington, D.C. 20037**

**Its Attorney**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary.....	ii
I     Sandwich Isles’ Petition Meets The Three Standard Conditions for Study Area Waivers.....	1
A.     Grant of the Petition Will Not Create An Adverse Impact on the Universal Service Fund.....	1
B.     The State Commission Does Not Object to Grant Of the Waiver.....	2
C.     The Comments Demonstrate Extraordinary Public Interest Benefits.....	2
II    The Entire Hawaiian Homelands Are the Proper Boundaries Of Sandwich Isles’ Study Area.....	5
A.     The Unique Legal and Operational Status of the HHL Requires Establishing the HHL as a Single Study Area Of Sandwich Isles Communications.....	5
B.     Grant of Sandwich Isles’ Petition Will Be Consistent With the Purpose of the Rules and Prior Waiver Decisions.....	6
III   Hawaiian Telcom Comments.....	7
IV    Time is of the Essence.....	10
V     Conclusion.....	11
Appendix A	
Appendix B	

## SUMMARY

In response to the Commission's October, 2004 Order, Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc. filed its Petition for waiver of the study area freeze, *nunc pro tunc*, in December, 2004. The Petition demonstrated that Sandwich Isles' request met all three prongs of the Commission's long standing standard evaluation criteria: no adverse impact on the Universal Service Fund, because Sandwich Isles' USF support will be less than one percent of the total high cost support for 2005; the state commission does not object; and grant of the waiver will serve the public interest. None of the comments filed challenge either of the first two assumptions. The large number of comments from residents, associations and educational institutions in the Hawaiian Homelands demonstrate the extraordinary public benefits Sandwich Isles has already provided and show that grant of the waiver will allow those benefits to continue and expand. The Hawaiian Congressional Delegations statement warns that denial of the waiver "could severely hamper continued deployment of critical infrastructure necessary to provide modern, reliable communications to the residents of the HHL...."

Given their unique legal and operational status, the proper boundaries for Sandwich Isles' study area are the entire Hawaiian Homelands, which is coextensive with the service area Sandwich Isles is obligated to serve by its license. Grant of the Petition will be consistent with the original purpose of the study area freeze, the Commission's decisions interpreting it, and the national policies supporting universal service and the deployment of broadband capability. The Commission should address this petition upon its unique facts and resolve broader policy questions in its rule making proceeding.

Hawaiian Telcom does not oppose Sandwich Isles' Petition but raises a number of issues which need not delay favorable action on the Petition. The suggestion that the Commission consider future year's USF impact, as well as the USF support to competitive ETCs is not consistent with established Commission policy and precedent. Sandwich Isles has used its USF support only to support those services for which support is intended; will continue to do so in the future; has so certified annually under oath; and is subject to audit by multiple government and private agencies, none of which have expressed any concern in this regard. Sandwich Isles has no intent and no authority to serve any areas outside of the HHL. The record demonstrates that no other service provider was willing to serve the entire HHL in 1997, and there is no evidence of any such willingness today. Grant of the petition will not create a flood of similar requests because the HHL and Sandwich Isles relationship with them are unique and not capable of replication elsewhere in the country.

A perhaps unforeseen effect of the Commission's October Order has been to deprive Sandwich Isles of access to capital funding while its Petition is pending. Expeditious action by the Commission is necessary for Sandwich Isles to be able to continue construction of infrastructure consistent with the development of the HHL and its license obligations. Denial of the waiver would leave Sandwich Isles unable to cover its existing debt obligations, much less attract new capital. The availability of modern telecommunications to current and future residents of the HHL depends upon prompt and positive action by the Commission.

**Before the  
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION  
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc.	)	
	)	
Petition for Waiver of the Definition of	)	CC Docket No. 96-45
“Study Area” Contained in Part 36,	)	
Appendix-Glossary and Sections 36.611,	)	
and 69.2(hh) of the Commission’s	)	
Rules	)	

**REPLY COMMENTS**

Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc. (“Sandwich Isles”), by its attorney, files these Reply Comments in response to the comments filed by various parties on or before February 8, 2005 regarding Sandwich Isles’ Petition for waiver of the definition of “study area.” The great majority of comments supported Sandwich Isles. The comments demonstrate the extraordinary public interest in a prompt grant of Sandwich Isles’ Petition in order that the residents of the Hawaiian Home Lands retain the opportunity to obtain modern telecommunications services critical to the fulfillment of the objectives of a Congressional commitment made almost 85 years ago.

**I SANDWICH ISLES PETITION MEETS THE THREE STANDARD CONDITIONS FOR STUDY AREA WAIVERS**

**A. Grant Of The Petition Will Not Create An Adverse Impact On The Universal Service Fund**

Since 1995, the Commission has evaluated whether grant of a study area waiver will have an adverse impact of the Universal Service Fund by examining whether there will be an annual aggregate shift in high cost support of one percent or more of the total

high cost fund for the pertinent funding year.<sup>1</sup> Sandwich Isles' Petition demonstrated that its USF support will be well under one percent for 2005 on the basis of USAC's first quarter projections. That assertion continues to be valid as the recently published second quarter 2005 projections show only a slight increase.<sup>2</sup> None of the comments challenge Sandwich Isles showing that its USF support for 2005 will be less than 1% of the total.

B. The State Commission Does Not Object to Grant of the Waiver

Subsequent to the filing of Sandwich Isles' Petition, the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission filed a letter in this proceeding stating that it does not object to grant of the waiver.<sup>3</sup> Sandwich Isles' Petition included a letter from the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands stating it supports grant of the waiver<sup>4</sup>. No party challenges either statement.

C. The Comments Demonstrate Extraordinary Public Interest Benefits

*When I began building our family home in Pu'ukapu, there were no roads, no water, no electricity and no telephone. We lived as pioneers for nearly five years. When Sandwich Isle representatives began showing up in the community to announce its pending telephone and fiber optic cable service, it represented a new beginning for most of us homesteaders. As such, I would like to underscore the fact that Sandwich Isle Communications has in essence become a partner with the Department of Hawaiian Home Lands, and provides a crucial element in bringing worldwide communications to native Hawaiian families*

Francis Kauhane

---

<sup>1</sup> *U S WEST Communications, Inc. and Eagle Telecommunications, Inc., Joint Petition for Waiver of the Definition of "Study Area" Contained in Part 36, Appendix-Glossary of the Commission's Rules*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 10 FCC Rcd 1771, 1774 (1995) ("Eagle"). Since this policy was adopted, although the total fund has grown, a substantial percentage of the carrier common line cost which was previously recovered through access charges has been shifted to USF, with the result that a one percent change may not reflect the same relative impacts as it did in 1995.

<sup>2</sup>  $(4,057,098 \times 4) / (992,533,108 \times 4) = .41$

<sup>3</sup> Letter from Carlito P. Caliboso, Chairman, Hawaii Public Utilities Commission, to Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary, January 10, 2005.

<sup>4</sup> Petition, Appendix D.

The comments in the record in this proceeding present a unique confirmation of the critical public interest benefits that can be expected from the grant of Sandwich Isles' Petition, and the severe public detriment that would be the inevitable result of denial, either outright or by simply delaying a decision. The comments demonstrate the essential role Sandwich Isles has played in helping to overcome the extreme difficulties that native Hawaiians have faced in attempting to construct communities in remote rural areas devoid of any infrastructure.

The Hawaii Congressional delegation agrees:

*[D]enial of the waiver and removal of SIC's ILEC status could severely hamper continued deployment of critical infrastructure necessary to provide modern, reliable communications services to the residents of the HHL.....we hope that [the Commission] will now move swiftly....<sup>5</sup>*

Eighty-four years after President Harding signed the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, and forty-six years after President Eisenhower signed the Hawaii Statehood Act, the development of the HHL to make them habitable for the intended beneficiaries is still not completed. Habitability in this age means there must be roads, electricity, water, sanitation and communication. DHHL is working hard to provide the first four necessities itself and has licensed Sandwich Isles to provide the fifth. The comments show the importance residents place on the availability of modern

---

<sup>5</sup> Letter from Senators Daniel K. Inouye and Daniel K. Akaka and Representatives Neil Abernethy and Ed Case to Chairman Michael K. Powell, February 7, 2005. A copy of this letter is attached as Appendix A.

communications in their personal lives, and to provide economic and educational opportunity.<sup>6</sup>

While there can be little argument about the essential need for modern communications by all citizens, especially in remote rural areas lacking other critical infrastructures, the comments also point out the extreme frustration of the HHL residents with the unavailability of adequate service at reasonable cost prior to Sandwich Isles bringing service to them.<sup>7</sup> Where residents were able to receive cellular service, it was unreliable, extremely expensive, and the handsets frequently had to be taken out to vehicles to be recharged. Efforts to obtain wireline service were met, at best, with demands for unaffordable aid-to-construction charges.

The historical evidence regarding unavailability of service in Sandwich Isles' Petition and the comments of HHL residents are relevant to the public interest test for a study area waiver today. The waiver request is for a *nunc pro tunc* grant in the context that the incumbent GTE's "operations"<sup>8</sup> in 1997 did not include more than a *de minimus* portion of the HHL. The history of the period shows that GTE found it convenient to tout

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g., Ahupua'a O Moloka'i ("Sandwich Isles Communications has enabled homesteaders without access to modern telecommunications the opportunity to participate in contemporary technology which would otherwise be unavailable...;" Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement ("...[T]he infrastructure being developed is a life-line long overdue, and one that will invest in the future of our entire island state. The investment has clear returns, and the lack of it predictable consequences."))

<sup>7</sup> Laene Hudgins, ("For over a decade, and prior to 2001, my neighbors and I had been without basic, reliable and affordable telephone service."); Nanakuli Hawaiian Homestead Community Association, ("Throughout our community-wide system, none of the major telecommunications systems were available to us prior to 1997 and are still not."); State Council of Hawaiian Homestead Associations ("The native Hawaiian owned and operated company took on the challenge back in 1997 to provide service to our homestead communities, *where no one else was willing to serve.*") (emphasis added).

<sup>8</sup> As Sandwich Isles noted in its petition, the Commission has never set metes and bounds of study areas, but considered the study area to be the area of the carrier's "operations." Petition at 14-15.



its “obligations” when it wanted to preclude another carrier from actually providing service, but ignored those obligations when to meet them would require it to actually invest in facilities. It is, therefore, in the public interest to recognize that Sandwich Isles not only committed at that time to serve the entire HHL, but has fulfilled that commitment by investing in infrastructure to provide modern communications services to people GTE choose to ignore. That history of neglect is the most compelling evidence that the service DHHL believes its residents need was not and is not available from another source.

## **II THE ENTIRE HAWAIIAN HOMELANDS ARE THE PROPER BOUNDARIES OF SANDWICH ISLES’ STUDY AREA**

- A. The Unique legal and operational status of the HHL requires establishing the HHL as a single study area of Sandwich Isles Communications.

Sandwich Isles’ Petition set forth at length the unique legal status and structure of the HHL and pointed out that these circumstances are not capable of replication in any other state.<sup>9</sup> Sandwich Isles’ Petition requested a study area encompassing the entire HHL because that is the area its license obligates it to provide service.<sup>10</sup> The Petition pointed out that the HPUC recognizes the authority of DHHL to control which entity

---

<sup>9</sup> Petition at 5-6, Hawaiian Telcom, at 8, misreads the Petition’s acknowledgement that LECs are understandably concerned about whether undeveloped pockets are “unserved” as contradicting the statement that the HHL are unique. Sandwich Isles only meant to recognize that in other states, or in parts of Hawaii outside of the HHL, the unserved issue could arise. Sandwich Isles’ current *de novo* Petition does not rely on the “unserved” exception to the study area waiver requirement. Sandwich Isles thus agrees with the comments of Verizon, at 1-2, that the Commission’s action on its Petition should address the particular facts presented and leave to its rulemaking proceedings the setting of broader policy.

<sup>10</sup> In its 1997 waiver proceeding, Sandwich Isles did not, as Hawaiian Telcom points out (p.5), include the areas currently being served by GTE. The current Petition is a *de novo* request and is not, nor could it be, a rehash of the 1997 Petition, nor a request for reconsideration of the October Order.

operates on the land for which it is trustee. DHHL's control of and limits on entities operating on the HHL are thus a function of its fiduciary role as a proprietor of lands held in trust for native Hawaiians.<sup>11</sup>

As discussed in the Petition, the Commission has never adopted clear definitions or guidelines for defining the boundaries of a study area beyond the previous definition that it was the company's "operations within a single state."<sup>12</sup> The Petition and the discussion in Part I show that as a historical matter, no more than one percent of the HHL could be considered GTE's operations in 1997 or Verizon's in 2005.<sup>13</sup> Sandwich Isles, however, is not only presently serving subscribers on five of the six major islands, but has the intent, and the capability to serve the remainder of the HHL to fulfill its license obligations. Designating its study area as the entire HHL will thus best serve the crucial public interest objective of bringing service to the native Hawaiian residents.

B. Grant of Sandwich Isles Petition Will Be Consistent With the Purpose of the Rules and Prior Waiver Decisions

The Commission froze study area boundaries to prevent carriers from subdividing average cost study areas into high and low cost study areas in order to increase their USF support.<sup>14</sup> Subsequently, the Commission extended this reasoning to arms-length sales of high cost exchanges on the theory that such sales enable the seller to, in effect, receive

---

<sup>11</sup> DHHL license provisions are thus not an appropriate subject for a Section 253 inquiry.

<sup>12</sup> CHR Solutions at 2.

<sup>13</sup> Petition at 13. Another of the articles cited by Hawaiian Telcom makes exactly this point: "...[M]ost of the land is so desolate and fallow that it has long gone ignored by developers and utilities. Except for a few homesteads near urban centers, Hawaii's main carrier (formerly GTE, now Verizon) *never built out its networks to serve the Home Lands.*" Carleen Hawn, "Dreaming and Scheming Hawaiian Style," *Forbes Magazine*, October 28, 2002. (emphasis added)

<sup>14</sup> *Skyline, Eagle.*

USF support for which it was not otherwise eligible.<sup>15</sup> Neither of these circumstances are presented by this Petition. Sandwich Isles is neither a spin-off of Verizon, nor a purchaser of any assets, subsidiaries or subscribers of Verizon.<sup>16</sup> Thus, unlike the purpose of the rule to preclude a carrier from receiving unintended USF support, Verizon receives no USF support either directly or indirectly as a result of the support that Sandwich Isles receives.

Grant of Sandwich Isles Petition therefore should set no precedent for the more common situation in which there is an existing LEC “ready, willing and able” to provide service to a previously undeveloped area.<sup>17</sup> Sandwich Isles therefore agrees with the comments of Verizon that this case should be decided upon its particular unique facts and not become a vehicle to revise universal service policy.

### **III Hawaiian Telcom Comments**

Hawaiian Telcom Mergersub, Inc. (“Hawaiian Telcom”) does not oppose Sandwich Isles’ Petition and acknowledges it has limited understanding of the facts and issues surrounding the Petition. Hawaiian Telcom is presently awaiting the approval of

---

<sup>15</sup> In 1997 the Commission adopted Section 54.305 which limits support to the buyer to that of the seller. That rule has since been modified by the “Safety Valve” rules. 47 C.F.R. 54.305 (b)-(f).

<sup>16</sup> See *U S West and Gila River Telecommunications, Inc. Joint Petition for Waiver of the Definition of “Study Area” Contained in Part 36, Appendix-Glossary, of the Commission’s Rules*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 7 FCC Rcd. 2161, 2162 (1992). (Waiver granted where new entity not a spin -off of incumbent nor designed specifically to capture Universal Service funds, “but a legitimate telephone company proposing legitimate and desirable service expansion.”)

<sup>17</sup> In granting a study area waiver to TelHawaii in 1997, the Commission recognized the concerns with GTE’s service to rural areas and concluded that the public interest would be served by creating a new study area in what had been a GTE exchange. *Petition for Waivers Filed by TelAlaska, Inc. and TelHawaii, Inc. Concerning Section 36.611, 36.612, 61.41(c)(2) and the Definition of “Study Area” Contained in the Part 36 Appendix-Glossary of the Commission’s Rules*, Memorandum Opinion and Order, DA 97-1508, 12 FCC Rcd 10309 (Com. Car. Bur.1997).

its purchase of Verizon Hawaii by the HPUC. Nonetheless, it raises a number of issues that it believes should be explored, even though it has no opinion as to the applicability or correct resolution of these issues. First, it suggests that the Commission should consider the impact on the USF percentages for future years and the indirect effects of support for competitive ETCs.<sup>18</sup> This suggestion is inconsistent with long established policy and would require speculation as to several events which are totally outside the control of Sandwich Isles, including the Commission's efforts at access reform and a downstream effect on USF support.<sup>19</sup> In addition, there is neither precedent nor sound policy reason to include the USF support paid to competitive ETCs as a part of this test. No previous study area waiver proceeding has considered such indirect effects.

Second, Hawaiian Telcom suggests that there is evidence that Sandwich Isles is using high cost support for services other than those for which the support is intended.<sup>20</sup> Sandwich Isles makes annual certifications, under oath, to the Hawaii Public Utilities Commission that it is in compliance with Section 254(e).<sup>21</sup> Furthermore, Sandwich Isles is subject to a multiplicity of auditing agencies including NECA, USAC, HPUC and RUS, as well as the Commission itself.<sup>22</sup> None of the audits conducted since Sandwich

---

<sup>18</sup> Hawaiian Telcom at 7.

<sup>19</sup> Even, assuming, *arguendo*, that with the addition of future and indirect effects the total impact might exceed one percent, for the reasons described in Section I.C, Sandwich Isles meets the "extraordinary public interest benefit" test.

<sup>20</sup> Hawaiian Telcom at 12-14.

<sup>21</sup> Copies of the last four such certifications were attached to the Petition as Appendix B.

<sup>22</sup> The statement of Hawaiian Telcom, at 14, to the contrary is incorrect. Aaron Stene's suggestion that Sandwich Isles is serving areas not permitted by its RUS financing is incorrect. Appendix B shows that the portions of the HHL in urban portions of Oahu are a minor portion of the service area.

Isles began operations has expressed any concern regarding the proper use of high cost support funds.

Third, Hawaiian Telecom suggests that Sandwich Isles has plans to serve areas outside of HHL. This is impossible since Sandwich Isles' certificate of authority from the HPUC is limited to providing service to "lands administered by DHHL."<sup>23</sup>

Fourth, Hawaiian Telecom contends that there is evidence that GTE was ready willing and able to provide service to the HHL. As evidenced by Sandwich Isles' Petition, this claim is simply not supported by the record.<sup>24</sup> The context of the GTE statements in its Application for Review upon which Hawaiian Telecom relies in making this statement is GTE's claim that the HHL areas in dispute were "served by some of the largest central offices in the State." The fact that prior to the grant of Sandwich Isles license by DHHL, GTE was providing service to subscribers in a few areas near its existing exchanges comprising less than one percent of the total HHL is not evidence that it was ready, willing or able to serve the other 99% of the HHL.

Fifth, Hawaiian Telecom raises the issue that granting of this Petition will lead to a flood of similar requests.<sup>25</sup> With the exception of a few Indian Reservations, any other areas entirely lack the crucial distinction of the HHL of a long waiting list of people with homestead rights to the land under a specific Congressional declaration of trust, and under the direction of a governmental trustee.

---

<sup>23</sup> *Application of Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc. for Authorization to Provide IntraLata and Intrastate Telecommunications Services Within and Between Hawaiian Home Lands Throughout the State of Hawaii Pursuant to HRS Section 269-16.9*, Doc. No. 96-0026, Order No. 16078, Nov. 14, 1997.

<sup>24</sup> Hawaiian Telecom at 9.

<sup>25</sup> Hawaiian Telecom at 7.

Finally, when considering the issues raised by Hawaiian Telcom, the Commission should seriously consider the fact that GTE's successor, Verizon Hawaii, did not raise any of these issues in their comments and does not oppose Sandwich Isles' Petition.

Since Hawaiian Telcom acknowledges that it is not fully acquainted with the facts surrounding the Petition, Sandwich Isles restates its offer to make itself available to acquaint Hawaiian Telcom with its operations in the Hawaii market and the history of service on the HHL. Sandwich Isles looks forward to working with Hawaiian Telcom to further the telecom interests of Hawaii after their acquisition of Verizon Hawaii and Sandwich Isles' Petition are completed.

#### **IV TIME IS OF THE ESSENCE**

The Commission in its October Order apparently intended to maintain Sandwich Isles' *status quo* while its waiver petition is pending. Unfortunately a direct consequence of the order has been to cast a cloud over Sandwich Isles' interstate revenue stream such that it is now substantially without access to the capital funding needed to maintain construction consistent with the development of the HHL. Denial of the waiver would effectively convert Sandwich Isles to CLEC status, without USF at all and with substantially reduced interstate access revenues. The elimination of this revenue would leave Sandwich Isles unable to cover its existing debt obligations, much less attract new capital. In turn not only would new residents of the HHL not receive telephone service, but even the existing subscribers would see their service either shut down or taken over by RUS. The Commission has before it sufficient information to decide this Petition, the continued and future access to communications service of the HHL residents depends upon prompt action.

## **V CONCLUSION**

Sandwich Isles Communications has demonstrated it has satisfied the Commission's three-prong test for waiver of the frozen study area rule and shown that its study area should be the Hawaiian Home Lands which it is obligated, ready, willing and able to serve. Sandwich Isles has invested a very large amount of capital in reliance of a decision of the Commission's staff which the Commission rejected after more than six years had passed. More importantly, native Hawaiians are now in a position to realize a promise made to them by Congress 85 years ago, but which the Commission's actions puts in jeopardy. The unique facts of this proceeding show that grant of the waiver Petition will result in extraordinary public benefits. This Commission and the Hawaiian legislature and Public Utility Commission tried once before in a small way to remedy the neglect of rural areas by the large incumbent carrier, but the effort was ultimately defeated by the incumbent's ability to continue litigation well beyond the resources of the new entrant. The Commission must act quickly to prevent the same result from occurring again.

Respectfully submitted

Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc.

By     /s/ David Cosson  
       Its Attorney

Kraskin, Moorman & Cosson, LLC  
2120 L St., N.W., Suite 520  
Washington, D.C. 20037  
202 296 8890

February 22, 2005

## **APPENDIX A**



United States Senate  
WASHINGTON, DC 20510

2005 FEB -7 AM 10:48

February 7, 2005

The Honorable Michael K. Powell  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Dear Mr. Chairman:

We write to urge the Commission to take swift action in resolving the recent petition filed by Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc. (SIC) (Docket No. 96-45) that would establish the Hawaiian Home Lands (HHL) as the SIC study area in Hawaii.

In 1921 as part of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act (HHCA), Congress set aside over 200,000 acres of land on six of the eight major Hawaiian Islands for the "rehabilitation" of native Hawaiians. The acreage set aside was undeveloped with the majority of lands far removed from populated areas and located in some of the most rugged and remote areas of Hawaii. Due to the high cost of providing phone service in these areas, residents in the HHL have historically faced severe challenges in their efforts to obtain modern communications services.

For over six years, SIC has been afforded ILEC status with respect to its provision of service to portions of the HHL. This status has been instrumental in SIC's efforts to attract capital and build modern telecommunications facilities on the HHL that are necessary to provide service to significant numbers of rural Hawaii residents. Despite these advances, it is our understanding that recent action by the Commission in October 2004 threatens to overturn this long-settled treatment unless favorable action is taken on the pending SIC petition.

Mr. Chairman, a key tenet of universal service, especially applied to rural and insular areas of the United States, is affordable access to telephone and broadband services. SIC is the only rural LEC in Hawaii, and the denial of the waiver and removal of SIC's ILEC status could severely hamper continued deployment of critical infrastructure necessary to provide modern, reliable communications services to the residents of the HHL. Thus, with recent action by the Commission having created the present uncertainty, we hope that it will now move swiftly to permit the creation of this new study area and to facilitate the deployment of modern communications networks to all Hawaii residents.

As this matter is important to each of us, we respectfully request that you provide our offices with regular updates on the status of the petition and your final decision as soon as it is made. Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Sincerely,

  
Senator Daniel K. Inouye

  
Senator Daniel K. Akaka

  
The Honorable Neil Abercrombie

  
The Honorable Ed Case

cc: The Honorable Commissioner Kathleen Abernathy  
The Honorable Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein  
The Honorable Commissioner Michael Copps  
The Honorable Commissioner Kevin Martin

## **APPENDIX B**

## SIC Service Areas & Line Counts

Line Information (Location)	Island	NXX	Existing Lines Jan '05	Total Island Population	Percent of Population	2005 Forecast	2006 Forecast
<b>Kauai</b>							
<b>Hanapepe</b>	1-Kauai	<b>820</b>	7			17	17
<b>Kekaha</b>	1-Kauai	<b>820</b>				0	50
<b>Anahola</b>	1-Kauai	<b>820</b>	14			24	24
<b>Total Kauai</b>			21	58,304	0.0360%	41	91

### Oahu Urban

<b>Kalawahine</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>	107			117	127
<b>Hart St</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>				0	5
<b>Total Oahu Urban</b>			107	525,694	0.0204%	117	132

### Oahu Rural

<b>Waianae</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>	12			18	18
<b>Consuelo</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>				0	30
<b>Kapolei</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>	223			243	263
<b>Kapolei Village 8</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>				0	200
<b>Kalaeloa</b>	2-Oahu	<b>520</b>	10			20	30
<b>Mililani</b>	2-Oahu	<b>426</b>	4			4	4
<b>Waimanalo</b>	2-Oahu	<b>426</b>	170			180	190
<b>Nanakuli</b>	2-Oahu	<b>620</b>	14			24	34
<b>Total Oahu Rural</b>			433	350,462	0.1236%	489	769

**Molokai**

<b>Kalamaula</b>	3-Molokai	<b>560</b>	57			67	77
<b>Hoolehua East</b>	3-Molokai	<b>560</b>	32			47	62
<b>Hoolehua Airport</b>	3-Molokai	<b>560</b>	38			53	68
<b>Total Molokai</b>			127	8,000	1.5875%	167	207

**Lanai**

<b>Lanai</b>	5-Lanai	<b>760</b>				30	60
<b>Total Lanai</b>	5-Lanai			3,164		30	60

**Maui**

<b>Kahikinui</b>	4-Maui	<b>760</b>	14			14	14
<b>Paukukalo</b>	4-Maui	<b>760</b>	26			26	26
<b>Kula</b>	4-Maui	<b>760</b>	79			100	190
<b>Lei Alii</b>	4-Maui	<b>760</b>				50	150
<b>Waiehu</b>	4-Maui	<b>760</b>	134			249	349
<b>Total Maui</b>			253	117,194	0.2159%	439	729

# Hawaii

<b>Waimea</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>890</b>	11			11	11
<b>Puukapu East</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>890</b>	25			30	30
<b>Puukapu</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>890</b>	33			33	33
<b>Lalamilo</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>890</b>				0	72
<b>Keaukaha</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>	13			13	13
<b>Kaumana</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>				15	25
<b>Piihonua</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>				15	25
<b>Waiakea</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>				10	20
<b>Discovery Harbour</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>				10	20
<b>Hilo</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>	33			41	41
<b>Laiopua</b>	6-Hawaii	<b>920</b>	246			266	266
<b>Total Hawaii</b>			361	148,677	0.2428%	444	556

<b>Total All Islands</b>		<b>1302</b>	<b>1,211,495</b>	<b>0.1075%</b>	<b>1686</b>	<b>2453</b>
--------------------------	--	-------------	------------------	----------------	-------------	-------------

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, David Cosson, certify that a copy of the foregoing Reply Comments of Sandwich Isles Communications, Inc. in CC Docket No. 96-45 was electronically served on each of the following on February 22, 2005:

Best Copy and Printing, Inc.  
445 12<sup>th</sup> St. S.W., Room CY-B402  
Washington, D.C.

Katie King  
Telecommunications Access Policy Division  
Wireline Competition Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Sheryl Todd  
Telecommunications Access Policy Division  
Wireline Competition Bureau  
Federal Communications Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20554